

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are requested to be cancelled.

No claims are currently being amended.

No claims are being added.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-30 remain pending in this application.

In paragraph 1 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner responds to Applicant's arguments in the previous response. The Examiner states:

With respect to the rejection of the last office action . . . , Applicant discusses U.S. Patent No. 6,201,797 in view of . . . U.S. Patent No. 5,524,272 Leuca teaches a ground-based station, but silent as to claimed limitation docking area for receiving order wire and video lvata [sic] from a distribution center, and communicates data to the mobile platform while the mobile platform is at the docking area. In analogous art, Podowski discloses a docking area . . . at which various entertainment and control data are communicated from a distribution center to said mobile platform . . .

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's comments.

In paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Final Office Action, claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,201,797 (Leuca) in view of U.S. Patent

No. 5,524,272 (Podowski). The Examiner's reasoning for the rejection is similar to the reasoning provided in the previous Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 (as previously presented) is in independent form and specifically recites that the "order wire data and video data from the wireless docking transceiver." Independent claim 1 also recites that the order wire data controls "a source of video for playback of a program being either video data in the second storage unit or the second satellite transceiver, or both the second storage unit and the second satellite transceiver." The combination of stored data and satellite data allows the selection of program content produced or transmitted during the period while the platform is mobile, including continuation of wide programs partially received while the mobile platform is stationary at the docking area (Specification p. 24, ll. 21-27). Therefore, claim 1 clearly recites a system which can provide video data from a storage unit on board the aircraft or from a satellite transceiver or from both. The playback is controlled by order wire data received from a wireless docking area transceiver.

The Examiner has relied on the combination of Podowski and Leuca to provide for a system which receives video data from onboard the aircraft or from a satellite receiver.

Podowski discloses only the provision of video data from a storage on the aircraft while Leuca discloses only the provision of data from a satellite receiver. Applicant notes that data server 12 in Leuca does not store video data for programming. Leuca states:

Data server 12 acts as an intelligent airborne gateway and performs multiplexing and necessary call control functions. More specifically, data server 12 provides 3 general functions:
1) controlling various data transport interfaces; 2) multiplexing, routing, and priority queuing functions for data packet; and
3) updating and maintaining various databases depending on the application as an off-line process and providing uniform user interface capability (API) to client applications.

See Leuca, col. 3, ll. 44-53.

Therefore, Leuca only discloses the provision of data from a satellite system. Even if the combination of Leuca and Podowski were to teach the provision of video data from storage onboard an aircraft, via satellite, and/or both, via storage onboard the aircraft and via satellite, the order wire limitations are still completely missing from the combination.

The Examiner relies on Podowski for teaching some sort of “order wire data.” Podowski only discloses a program menu. However, the program menu of Podowski does not perform the order wire function as recited in independent claim 1. The program menu of Podowski is clearly not used to select playback via the satellite receiver, the storage unit, or both the storage unit and the satellite transceiver. All that program menu does is control the storage of the video signals in the appropriate aircraft. It does not provide for selection of the video data for playback from a storage source, a satellite source, and both the storage source and the satellite source. Clearly, to transform Leuca using Podowski into the communication system including an order wire as recited in claim 1 would require modification which is only taught by Applicant’s disclosure.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 12, 13 and 17 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-11, 14-16 and 18-30 are also patentable. See U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4.

Applicant further notes, the various dependent claims recite features which are not shown, described or suggested in the cited art. For example, dependent claim 5 recites that the wireless platform transceiver is a radio frequency short-range transceiver (emphasis added). Clearly, Podowski does not show a short-range transceiver. The section cited by the Examiner in Leuca for such a transceiver appears to be related to the wireless transmission between gateway 22 and antenna 21. Short-range transceivers are clearly not shown, described or suggested. Accordingly, claim 5 is additionally patentable over Leuca and Podowski.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 11, 2008

Customer No. 26383

Telephone: (319) 295-1184

Facsimile: (319) 295-8777

By /Joseph N. Ziebert/

Joseph N. Ziebert

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 35,421